DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 013 SP 010 196

AUTHOR Webb, Rodman B.; Guinagh, Barry J.
TITLE The Translation of Theory Into Practice: A Study of Students' Perceptions of the Childhood Education Program.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Education Majors; *Field Experience Programs; *Preservice Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Schools of Education; Student Opinion; Teacher Education; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *Childhood Education Program

ABSTRACT

This is a study of two teams in the Childhood Education Program (CEP) at the University of Florida. It is an examination of how closely the program, as presently implemented, matches its own theoretical underpinnings. Volunteer CEP students helped to devise the questionnaire, which was given to two teams of CEP students. Some of the topics covered in the questionnaire were: (1) the CEP seminars; (2) community sessions; (3) the CEP faculty; (4) counseling and explanation of CEP; (5) field experience; and (6) learning activities. Separate discussions are presented for each of the six major topics in the questionnaire. The results of the data collected present the weaknesses and strengths of the program. Tables are included, and a copy of the questionnaire is appended. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126013

THE TRANSLATION OF THEORY INTO PRACTICE: A STUDY OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

by

Rodman B. Webb and Barry J. Guinagh
University of Florida
February 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP010 196

This report was supported in part by the Departments of Childhood Education and Foundations of Education.

Contents

Foreword, by William D. Hedges - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - i

Introduction - 1

Methodology - 3

CEP Seminar - 4

Community Session - 7

CEP Faculty - 9

Counseling and Explanation of CEP - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 15

Field Experience - 16

Learning Activities - 20

The "Need to Know" Concept - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 20

The Coercion-Free Curriculum - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 23

Modifying Learning Activities in the Coercion-Free Curriculum - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 24

Academic Interaction Between Students and Faculty in the Coercion-Free Curriculum - - - - - - - - 26

Student Attitudes Toward Learning Activities - - - - - - - 30

Student Self Concept in CEP - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 35

Conclusion - 39

Appendix A: CEP Questionnaire - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 52

FOREWORD

William D. Hedges

Chairperson, Childhood Education Department

This study of two of the teams in CEP (I and III) should be carefully read by any faculty or students interested in improving the program. It is carefully done, refreshingly frank and reasonably comprehensive.

It is atypical for faculty to study their program and then to set forth the perceived strengths and weaknesses for all to view. That this is done here is a credit to all who believe that, through formative evaluation, data can be obtained which can result in decisions for continuing development. Just as one of the basic tenets of Professor Combs is that "The development of an effective teacher is a process of becoming," just so it may be said that the development of an effective teacher education program is a process of becoming.

All is not well with CEP. Faculty realize this; students perceive it. As chairperson of one of the two departments responsible for the program, I, too, am concerned. This is despite the belief that comparative data with other preservice programs in undergraduate teacher education would (I am convinced) reveal us to be doing as well as most and better than many. However, we cannot deny that the premises of this program make us peculiarly vulnerable to and, properly, unusually responsible for student perceptions and attitudes.

Apparent from this study is that, as perceived by the students, only two of three believe they are getting a good education, four of ten would prefer a more traditional program if field work were to be included, over half feel they are forced into non-meaningful learning activities and three out of five find it difficult to find and talk with faculty.

It is also apparent from the study that three out of four find the seminars helpful, three out of five find the CEP helps them with their self concept, four out of five indicate never having cheated and four out of five believe CEP has helped them to learn to accept responsibility.

Not apparent from the study is the tremendous dedication of members of the faculty to the principles of freedom and self direction on which the program is directed nor the tremendous demands made on the time and energy of faculty in order to maintain the program.

Nor does the study make as clear as it might that those students most strongly dedicated to becoming outstanding teachers have almost unlimited degrees of freedom to make meaningful adjustments in their program as and when they choose.

Overall, it is evident there are weaknesses; there are strengths. But clearly this program is placing a considerable press on faculty and students alike. The question arises as to whether this tremendous expenditure of energy and time is justified by the results. Would a more traditional teacher education program be more efficient and yet about as effective? My personal belief is that it would not.

What we should do, instead, is study the results, dialogue with our colleagues and the students and then sincerely and openly make plans to rectify some of the more pressing problems. If we do, we will not only have a good preservice program in teacher education but an absolutely superb one. We are on the right track!

THE TRANSLATION OF THEORY INTO PRACTICE: A STUDY OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

Introduction

The Childhood Education Program (CEP) began as an experiment in the winter of 1969. The conceptual roots of the program, however, reach back at least as far as 1958 when Arthur Combs and Daniel Soper undertook research to uncover common characteristics of successful practitioners in the helping professions. Over the years their conclusions were incorporated into a philosophy of teacher education which is spelled out in greatest detail in The Professional Education of Teachers: A Humanistic Approach to Teacher Preparation (Arthur W. Combs et al., 1974) and Humanistic Teacher Education: An Experiment in Systematic Curriculum Innovation (Wass, et al., 1974). What began as an experiment in teacher education developed into an ongoing program based on a perceptual-humanistic theory rather than a traditional, behavioristic S-R psychology. It is Combs' belief that there has been a misplaced emphasis on the purely cognitive approaches to teacher education and he proposes that ". . . teacher education is not a question of learning 'how to teach' but a matter of personal discovery, of learning how to use one's self and surroundings to assist other persons to learn. The Florida program is a humanistic one designed to help each student find his own best way of teaching. As such, it represents an alternative model to the traditional, behavioristically oriented thinking currently in fashion in many colleges and state and federal agencies" (Wass, et al., 1974, Preface).

The Childhood Education Program, in contrast to many programs in teacher education, was developed in the light of research findings, "in a disciplined fashion rarely seen in curriculum innovation" (Wass, et al., 1974, Preface). Combs and others have outlined the progression from research to philosophy and on to curriculum innovation as follows:

a. It began in twelve years of basic research on the nature of the helping professions, especially on the nature of good and poor teachers.

b. These research results were then combined with modern thinking from perceptual-humanistic psychology to formulate a theory of teacher education.

c. This theory was given practical expression in an experimental program designed and placed in operation side by side with a traditional one.

d. A program of research was then instituted to provide information concerning the relative effectiveness of the program. And finally,

e. The experimental program was adopted by the Department and over a two-year period replaced the old program.

The feedback research done on the experimental program (see d above) sought to measure "the effectiveness of /CEP/ teachers in the classroom" (Wass et al., 1974, p. 30). This research yielded generally positive results.

> The follow-up study was on a small scale, restricted in the number of teachers, length of observation time and instrumentation. While admittedly far less comprehensive and complete than we would like, assessment must be made in ways possible to the staff. Decisions about excellence can't wait for all possible data. Therefore, we made the best judgment possible on the basis of data we had or could get within limits of time and resources available. On that basis we decided that the new program was our best bet and adopted it as our model. We will, of course, continue to research in every possible manner when we are able. (Wass et al., 1974, p. 48)

The follow-up research done in the early stages of the Childhood Education Program was conducted under the supervision of Hannelore Wass. In one report of her findings she comments, "Evaluating the goals of an experimental curriculum, as suggested here, means asking questions such as: How firmly are the goals anchored in theory? How well are they supported by evidence? How sound are they, and how responsive to contemporary needs and to society's purposes?" (Wass et al., p. 35) The research reported in this monograph takes Wass's questions one step further. Rather than attempting an investigation into the validity of the theoretical assumptions upon which the Childhood Education Program was based, this study attempted to investigate the degree to which this experiment in teacher education lived up to its theoretical assumptions. Thus, this study differs from previous research in two ways: First, it is a descriptive study rather than a comparative evaluation, and second, it studies the program as it is viewed by students while they are immersed within it. In effect, this is an examination of how closely the program, as presently implemented, matches its own theoretical underpinnings.

It is necessary to make clear at the outset that this study was motivated only by desire to find out what was going on in the Childhood Education Program. It is not an evaluative study in any sense beyond its attempt to test out how completely theory has withstood a translation into practice. It must be admitted that most educational programs are protected by the inertia of tradition against this kind of scrutiny. Because we do not have a great deal of data on more traditional approaches to teacher education it would not be appropriate to make easy comparisons. Perhaps it would be beneficial to examine traditional programs as carefully as we do innovative ones.

Methodology

Volunteer CEP students helped us develop a questionnaire which was tested on a small sample of students. A team of about 15 students worked with us and personally administered the trial run questionnaire to other students in the program. On the basis of the pre-test results the questionnaire was revised. After further trial runs we modified the questionnaire a second and third time until we settled on the fourth and final version.

It was our original intent that the questionnaire be administered by students on an individual basis to a randomly selected sample of 50 percent of CEP I and CEP III students. We chose CEP I because it was the direct descendant of the original experimental program and most of the CEP originators were still affiliated with that team. CEP III was chosen to represent a more recent model of the program. CEP II and CEP IV were excluded because the authors were a part of these teams and we felt our presence might in some way bias the results.

Our early attempt at individual interviewing was unsuccessful because of missed appointments and inability to contact many of the students. It was, therefore, decided to administer the questionnaire in a group setting within seminars in Spring, 1974. We visited the nine seminars that make up CEP I and III. All seminar directors were extremely cooperative and welcomed us hospitably. Since seminars were divided into subgroups, the questionnaire was given to about fifteen students at a time. After the end of the Spring Quarter, we mailed questionnaires to those individuals who had been absent when the questionnaire was administered.

Great care was taken to protect the anonymity of students taking part in the study. They were asked not to write their names on the questionnaire and were not asked any information that would make their responses in some way identifiable. They were aware that the questionnaire was anonymous, and that feedback would be given both to the faculty and to the students when the results were finally tabulated. In all, 204 questionnaires were completed: 98 from CEP I and 106 from CEP III. All data were collected in the Spring and Summer Quarters of 1974.

CEP Seminar

Seminars have been described as the "home base" of students in the CEP program. Each seminar is made up of "a group of 30 students and one faculty member, who form themselves into a small community of persons seeking to learn and to help each other learn. These 30 are divided each term into two discussion groups which meet weekly for two class periods. The primary purpose of these groups is for each student to discover his own personal meaning through exploration of himself and the ideas and experiences he has been exposed to in the previous week in an atmosphere designed to further such exploration and discovery" (Combs, et al., 1974, p. 157). The purpose of the seminar is to serve as a non-academic setting in which students can communally explore the meaning of their educational experiences. It also serves as the single most reliable source of continuity in the program.

We asked a series of questions regarding the seminar in an effort to determine how often students attended these meetings, their feelings regarding them, and to what degree they felt forced to participate in them. The results are listed below under the questions as they appeared on the questionnaire.

Table 1

How often do you attend seminar?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentages	Adjusted Percentages
Almost never	0	0	0
Infrequently	6	2.9	3.0
Almost always	65	31.9	32.3
Always	130	63.7	64.7
No response	3	1.5	Missing

Table 2

How helpful have you found seminar to be in preparing you for teaching?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Of no help	9	4.4	4.5
Seldom helpful	23	11.3	11.6
Somewhat helpful	89	43.6	44.9
Very helpful	77	37.7	38.9
No response	6	2.9	Missing

Table 3

Are you forced to do things /seminar/ that you don't want to do and are not helpful to you?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Always	32	15.7	16.2
Much of the time	17	8.3	8.6
Seldom	58	28.4	29.4
Never	82	40.2	41.6
Don't know	8	3.9	4.1
No response	7	3.4	Missing

Table 4

/Is seminar/ the source of any pressure you may be under?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
No pressure	152	74.5	75.2
Moderate pressure	39	19.1	19.3
Great pressure	9	4.4	4.5
Don't know	2	1.0	1.0
No response	2	1.0	Missing

The above tables indicate a number of things regarding seminar. First, it is attended regularly by students; a finding that is not surprising due to the fact that seminar is often (though not always) a required activity (see Table 1). Despite required attendance, however, the seminar is almost universally acknowledged to be a worthwhile experience for students. Only 15.7 percent of the students questioned indicated that it was seldom or never helpful in preparing them for teaching (see Table 2). When we asked the more specific question "Are you forced to do things /seminar/ that you don't want to do and are not helpful to you?" only 24 percent indicated that this was the case always or much of the time (see Table 3). Students gave equally high marks to the seminar when we queried them regarding the pressure that seminars may put on students. Only 4.4 percent of the students questioned felt seminar to be the source of great pressure (see Table 4). It is very probable, then, that seminars are fulfilling their function as defined by Blume: "When an education venture expects its students to change, it needs to build in a component of security and warmth to give them a feeling of stability. In this program the seminar is the primary psychological support system for the students" (Wass et al., 1974, p. 20).

Further evidence in support of seminar success is found in a word association question. We asked students to indicate the first word that came into their minds in association with the word "seminar". Forty-two and nine-tenths percent associated positive words such as "friends," "helpful," "interesting--fun," and "happy." Only 19.2 gave negative words such as "boring," "bah," and "generally wasteful." All other students gave neutral words or comments that could not be coded into positive or negative categories.

There were nine different seminar directors with from 17 to 28 students each participating in this study. When the data are examined by seminar director there are some indications of differences between the nine leaders on the word association test.

Community session

Within each of the four CEP teams, community sessions are called to bring all the students together on a regular basis. The purpose of these sessions is to encourage a feeling of community among the students and faculty. Various activities are undertaken during this period such as a play by one of the seminars, a lecture by a visiting scholar, a party or some other event students and faculty deem worthwhile. We asked a variety of questions regarding community session in an effort to determine how often they were attended, student feelings in regard to them, and to what degree people felt forced to participate within them. The results are listed below under the questions as they appeared on the questionnaire:

Table 5

How often have you attended community session?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Almost never	12	5.9	6.1
Infrequently	36	17.6	18.3
Almost always	93	45.6	47.2
Always	56	27.5	28.4
No response	7	3.4	Missing

Table 6

How helpful have you found community session in preparing you for teaching?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Of no help	34	16.7	18.1
Seldom helpful	77	37.7	41.0
Somewhat helpful	67	32.8	35.6
Very helpful	10	4.9	5.3
No response	16	7.8	Missing

Table 7

Are you forced to do things /_ in community session _/ that you don't want to do and that are not helpful to you?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Always	29	14.2	14.5
Much of the time	49	24.0	24.5
Seldom	52	25.5	26.0
Never	58	28.4	29.0
Don't know	12	5.9	6.0
No response	4	2.0	Missing

Table 8

/_ Is community session _/ the source of any pressure you may be under?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Adjusted Frequency
No pressure	128	72.7	65.6
Moderate pressure	44	21.6	22.6
Great pressure	19	9.3	9.7
Don't know	4	2.0	2.1
No response	9	4.4	Missing

Responses to questions regarding the community session indicate that it is not as successful as the seminar in meeting its stated objectives. Almost a quarter of the students indicated that they attended community session infrequently or almost never (see Table 5). 54.4 percent of students questioned indicated that they found community session to be of little or no help in preparing them for their careers in teaching (see Table 6). Negative feelings toward the community session do not seem to be the result of pressure (only 9.3 percent indicated that they felt under great pressure in community session) but rather seems to stem from a general student perception that time in community session was not constructively spent. Not all seminar leaders require attendance at community session; nevertheless, 38.2 percent of the students indicated that they felt forced to do things (always or much of the time) that they didn't want to do or that were not helpful to them in community session (see Table 7).

Even stronger negative feelings against the community session

became evident in the word association question. Students were asked to write the first word that came into their minds that they associated with "community session." Only 14.3 percent of students associated positive words such as "helpful," "relaxation," "friends," experiences shared," and "interesting." A majority (61.1 percent) gave negative associations such as "pain," "bad," "waste of time," "yuck!," and "Unnecessary." By far the most frequently used negative word was "boring." The remaining responses were either neutral or could not be coded into positive or negative categories.

The fact that community session is negatively perceived by a majority of students will not come as a surprise to faculty members. Student dissatisfaction with this activity has been evident for some time. An effort to increase student participation in the planning of community session activities does not seem to have significantly altered students' perceptions regarding community session as of spring 1974.

CEP Faculty

The key to any educational program is the quality of its faculty and the leadership it provides. The humanistic philosophy of the CEP program calls for a new breed of professors. As some CEP founders have put it, "The purpose of teaching is service; its primary goal is the growth of self in the student, not the teacher. This is a goal often lost sight of, particularly by college teachers addicted to lecturing. As one student put it, commenting on his college frustrations, 'I always thought college was for the nourishment of the student, but I was wrong. College exists for the enhancement of the professor!'" (Combs et al., 1974, p. 84). Beyond the traditional role of teacher as bearer of information the CEP program demanded "two other roles less frequently seen in the past."

> One of these is the role of teacher as facilitator. This is the role required of teachers operating in an open system of thinking. It calls for teachers whose primary focus is on the creation of effective processes of learning, teachers who know how to facilitate, help, aid, and assist students in a problems approach to education. The other role increasingly demanded of teachers in our time is the teacher as consultant. This is the role demanded of teachers when students are actively engaged in the search for their own development or in the pursuit of their own special needs. (Wass et al., 1974, p. 10)

The new breed of teacher as facilitator and teacher as consultant demands that the traditional social distance between professors and students somehow be broken down. Students would have to find professors more approachable, easier to communicate with and more aware of their

needs than is traditionally the case. In order to get some measure of how well CEP was accomplishing this end, we asked students a number of questions that called for a comparison of CEP faculty with the faculty students studied with in their first two years of college. We asked students "Do you know the CEP faculty better than the faculty in your previous college experience?" Almost 60 percent of students questioned responded that they knew the CEP faculty better. When we crossed the results from this question with the length of time students had spent in the CEP program there was a marked (though not statistically significant) trend indicating that the longer students were in the program the better they got to know CEP faculty (see Table 9).

Table 9

Do you know the CEP faculty better than the faculty in your previous college experience?
By number of quarters completed in program

Response	Quarters completed in program						Totals[b]
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Yes	11 (37.9)[a]	14 (60.9)	26 (56.5)	16 (51.6)	17 (77.3)	36 (73.5)	120 (60.0)
No	15 (51.7)	8 (34.8)	18 (39.1)	14 (45.2)	5 (22.7)	10 (20.4)	70 (35)
Other	3 (60.3)	1 (4.3)	2 (4.3)	1 (3.2)	0 (0)	3 (6.1)	10 (5)

[a]Relative percentage by quarter

[b]Four responses missing; N = 200

$X^2 = 15.91$ with df = 10; significance = 0.10.

We got slightly different results when we asked a somewhat different question, "How do you see, generally, the CEP faculty as different from the faculty you had before you entered CEP?" Forty-eight percent said that the CEP faculty was generally better, while only 8.5 percent said they were worse (see Table 10).

Table 10

How do you see, generally, the CEP faculty as different from the faculty you had before you entered CEP?
By quarters completed in program

Response	Quarters completed in program						Totals[b]
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Better	15 (50.0)[a]	11 (47.8)	19 (42.2)	13 (44.8)	9 (39.1)	31 (63.3)	98 (49.2)
About the same	9 (30.0)	8 (34.8)	17 (37.8)	10 (34.5)	10 (43.5)	15 (30.6)	69 (34.7)
Worse	1 (3.3)	3 (13.0)	4 (8.9)	4 (13.8)	2 (8.7)	3 (6.1)	17 (8.5)
Don't know	5 (33.3)	1 (4.3)	5 (11.1)	2 (6.9)	2 (8.7)	0 (0)	15 (7.5)

[a]Relative percentage

[b]Five responses missing; N = 199

$X^2 = 14.99$ with df = 15; significance = 0.45.

When we asked students, "Generally do you feel the CEP faculty knows and likes you?" we got somewhat more positive results. 61.5 percent of students answered affirmatively, while 9.7 percent gave a negative answer. Results on this question varied significantly with time spent in the program (see Table 11).

Table 11

Generally do you feel that the CEP faculty knows and likes you?
By quarters completed in the program

Response	Quarters completed in program						Totals[b]
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Yes	11 (39.3)[a]	7 (30.4)	23 (54.8)	23 (74.2)	20 (90.9)	36 (73.5)	120 (61.5)
No	4 (14.3)	3 (13.0)	6 (14.3)	2 (6.5)	1 (4.5)	3 (6.1)	19 (9.7)
Unsure	13 (46.4)	13 (56.5)	13 (31.0)	6 (19.4)	1 (4.5)	9 (18.4)	56 (28.7)

[a]Relative percentage

[b]Nine responses missing, N = 195

X^2 = 34.4 with d.f = 15; significance = 0.003.

In an effort to get some measure of students' evaluation of faculty performance we asked, "Generally, is the faculty fulfilling its responsibility to help train you to become a teacher?" We do not have comparison data from more traditional programs on this "consumer satisfaction" question so that it is difficult to evaluate our findings. We do not know, for example, whether a 58.1 percent positive response is a sign of progress or not. We viewed the 13.1 percent negative response as heartening but found the 28.8 percent "unsure" response to this question to be worrisome (see Table 13). No trends are discernible when answers to this question are cross tabulated with the number of quarters students have completed in CEP.

Table 12

Generally is the faculty fulfilling its responsibility to help train you to become a teacher? By quarters completed in program

Response	Quarters completed in program						Totals[b]
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Yes	19 (63.3)[a]	14 (60.9)	28 (62.2)	10 (35.7)	15 (65.2)	29 (59.2)	115 (58.1)
No	1 (3.3)	2 (8.7)	4 (8.9)	6 (21.4)	4 (17.4)	9 (18.4)	26 (13.1)
Unsure	10 (33.3)	7 (30.4)	13 (28.9)	12 (42.9)	4 (17.4)	11 (22.4)	57 (28.8)

[a]Relative percentage by quarter

[b]Six responses missing; N = 198

X^2 = 11.78 with d.f. = 10; significance = 0.24.

There was a somewhat larger "unsure" response when the question was rephrased to read "Do you feel that the faculty is doing an adequate job in preparing you for teaching?" Again, no trends were discernible when answers to this question were crossed with the number of quarters completed in CEP.

Table 13

Do you feel that the faculty is doing an adequate job in preparing you for teaching? By quarters completed in the program

Response	Quarters completed in program						Totals[b]
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Yes	13 (43.3)	15 (65.2)	21 (45.7)	9 (29.0)	12 (52.2)	25 (51.0)	95 (47.0)
No	2 (6.7)	3 (13.0)	6 (13.0)	6 (19.4)	4 (17.4)	5 (10.2)	26 (12.9)
Unsure	15 (50.0)	5 (21.7)	19 (41.3)	16 (51.6)	7 (30.4)	9 (38.8)	81 (40.1)

[a]Relative percentage by quarter
[b]Two responses missing; N = 202
X^2 = 10.97 with df = 10; significance = 0.36.

Again, because of a lack of comparison data, it is hard to know how to evaluate these results. If, however, we lay the question of comparison aside and merely concentrate on these results from the humanistic perspective central to CEP, we cannot fail to be concerned that over 50 percent of CEP students indicate that they are either unsure or unconvinced that the faculty is doing an adequate job in preparing them for their chosen profession (see Table 13).

The CEP program has been developed in keeping with the assertion that students learn best when they have a perceived need to know. Faculty members are more likely to be effective teachers when a student comes to them with a "felt problem." The usefulness of this insight can be compromised, however, when more pedestrian concerns, such as faculty availability, are ignored. Professors, of course, do not need to be on constant call to administer to client needs. Learning emergencies, unlike medical ones, can withstand the strain of reasonable amounts of waiting. There must be a point, however, when the frustrations of waiting can get in the way of productive learning. We therefore asked students "How easy is it to find and talk with faculty?" The results indicate that student learning may be frustrated somewhat by a general inability to contact faculty when they are needed. 7.4 percent of students thought that it was very easy to find and talk with faculty. 28.4 percent of students indicated that it was somewhat easy. 61.3 percent of students indicated that it was somewhat difficult or very difficult to contact faculty (see Table 14). When these findings are tabulated by the number of quarters a student has spent in the program we find that student frustration regarding faculty availability increases the longer a student stays in CEP (See Table 15).

Table 14

How easy is it to find and talk with faculty?

Response	Absolute Frequence	Relative Percentages	Adjusted Percentages
Very easy	15	7.4	7.6
Somewhat easy	58	28.4	29.3
Somewhat difficult	92	45.1	46.5
Very difficult	33	16.2	16.7
No response	6	2.9	Missing

Table 15

How easy is it to find and talk with faculty?
By quarters completed in the program

Response	Quarters completed in program						Total[b]
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Very or somewhat easy[c]	13 (46.4)[a]	11 (47.8)	17 (36.9)	9 (30.0)	6 (27.2)	17 (35.4)	73 (37.0)
Somewhat or very difficult[c]	15 (53.6)	12 (52.2)	29 (63.0)	21 (70.0)	16 (72.7)	31 (64.6)	124 (62.9)

[a]Relative percentage by quarter
[b]Seven responses missing; N = 197
[c]Two responses combined

Anyone familiar with the CEP operation knows that faculty work very hard to make themselves available to students. In our opinion, the demand for faculty time simply overreaches the capabilities of faculty to meet it. Many students volunteered the opinion somewhere on their questionnaires that faculty members are overworked and therefore cannot successfully accomplish all that is required of them. Some students may be ignorant of this fact, however, and may perceive faculty members as being aloof, abrupt or unconcerned with their problems. The program does promise a very special kind of attention to student needs and some students may feel a great frustration when this promise, for whatever reason, is not faithfully fulfilled.

Counseling and Explanation of the Childhood Education Program

Students were asked several questions dealing with the counseling and introduction to CEP they received when entering the program. 67.6 percent of the students responded that their introduction to CEP was not satisfactory (see Table 16).

Table 16

Was your introduction to CEP in your first weeks in the program satisfactory?

Response	Absolute frequency	Relative percentage	Adjusted percentage
Yes	57	27.9	28.1
No	138	67.6	68.0
Don't know	8	3.9	3.9
No response	1	0.5	Missing

In response to a similar question, only 15.7 percent of CEP students indicated that they were given all the information they needed during their initial counseling (Table 17).

Table 17

Did /¯your introduction to CEP¯/ give you all the information you needed to know?

Response	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted frequency
Yes	32	15.7	15.8
No	164	80.4	80.8
Don't know	7	3.4	3.4
No response	1	0.5	Missing

Somewhat more positive results were found when we asked if students learned what was expected of them during their initial counseling. 32.8 percent of students responded that their introduction was adequate in this regard while 58.8 percent indicated that it was not (see Table 18).

Table 18

Did /¯your introduction to CEP¯/ explain what was expected of you?

Response	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted frequency
Yes	67	32.8	33.5
No	120	58.8	60.0
Don't know	13	6.4	6.5
No response	4	2.0	Missing

Field Experience

The central experience in the CEP program is the students' field work in the schools. "The experiences begin with a four-hour per week experience with one or a few children and increase in time involved and degree of responsibility assumed by students over the following five quarters" (Wass et al., 1974, p. 15). We asked students questions regarding the pressure they felt under while working with teachers in the schools (see Table 19). Only 2.9 percent indicated that they felt great pressure in this area, while 51.5 percent felt moderate pressure and 44.1 percent felt no pressure at all. Similar results were found when we asked students if they felt pressure while working with children in the schools (see Table 20). Only 2.9 percent of the students felt great pressure while

37.7 percent felt moderate pressure and 57.4 percent felt no pressure at all.

Table 19

To what degree is working with teachers in the school a source of pressure?

Response	Absolute frequency	Relative percentage	Adjusted percentage
No pressure	90	44.1	44.8
Moderate pressure	105	51.5	52.2
Great pressure	6	2.9	3.0
Don't know	0	0	0

Table 20

To what degree is working with children in the schools a source of pressure?

Response	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted frequency
No pressure	117	57.4	58.5
Moderate pressure	77	37.7	38.5
Great pressure	6	2.9	3.0
Don't know	0	0	0
No response	4	2.0	Missing

These figures show that working in the schools is less a source of pressure than learning activities (see below) but a greater source of pressure than seminars or community sessions. The fact that students feel under some, but not excessive, pressure may indicate that they feel the weight of responsibility of teaching but are not buckled by it. If there is such a thing as an optimal amount of pressure which facilitates growth, then perhaps the school experience is providing a pressure which leads neither to nonchalance nor undue anxiety but rather to optimal growth.

25.5 percent of students say they felt forced in the field experience always or much of the time (see Table 21). The wording of the question is such that we cannot tell if students are dissatisfied with the field experience in general or with certain tasks they are asked to do when working with teachers in the field. In any case, field experience is not without pressure.

Table 21

Are you forced to do things /_field experience_/ which you don't want to do and are not helpful to you?

Response	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted frequency
Always	35	17.2	18.0
Much of the time	17	8.3	8.8
Seldom	66	32.4	34.0
Never	72	35.3	37.1
Don't know	4	2.0	2.1
No response	10	4.9	Missing

Students spend a considerable amount of time in the schools. 77.5 percent spend eight hours or more each week. They spend much less time preparing for their work in the schools. Fifty percent of students spend three hours or less per week preparing for work in schools. Only 17.2 percent spend more than eight hours preparing (see Table 22).

Table 22

How many hours do you spend in schools and preparing for your work in schools?

Hours	In schools?	Preparing for your work in schools?
1	1.0[a]	14.7[a]
2	0.5	16.2
3	0.5	16.7
4	1.5	10.8
5	1.0	11.8
6	9.8	7.4
7	6.9	0.5
8 or more	77.5	17.2
No response	1.5	4.9

[a]percentages

We were interested in who students talked to about their field experience. Specifically we asked "In the last two weeks, who have you talked to about specific problems in your field experience in the schools?" 60.3 percent had spoken to other CEP students, while 55.4 had spoken to teachers in the school (see Table 23). CEP faculty were consulted somewhat less frequently. 44.1 percent of the students indicated that they had brought problems to the CEP faculty. Other students on the campus were spoken to by 39.2 percent of CEP students, and 33.8 percent of

students spoke with parents, husbands and wives about their field experience. (Answers to this question adds to more than 100 percent because multiple answers were possible.) Ideally, perhaps, CEP faculty would be utilized somewhat more frequently by students working on school-related problems. The theory of the program is that the experience in the field creates a "need to know" which carries over into learning activities and is the driving force behind the students' learning. We find, however, that 55.4 percent of the students were talking about problems they found in the classroom with their classroom teachers. Perhaps this is to be expected. It is hard to know whether we should be elated or concerned about the fact that fewer students (44.1 percent) were bringing their school-based problems to CEP faculty for discussion. Perhaps that is a good percentage and it is certainly worth pointing out that many more students availed themselves of faculty help in this program than was probably possible in more traditional approaches to teacher education.

Table 23

In the last two weeks, who have you talked to about specific problems in your field experience in the school?

	% talked to about problem
CEP students	60.3
Teachers in school	55.4
CEP faculty	44.1
Other students	39.2
Parents, Husbands, Wives	33.8
Others	11.8

It is safe to say that the field experience is the single most successful element in the Childhood Education Program. When students were asked 'Without the field experience would you feel you were getting a good education?' only 8.3 percent answered positively. 78.4 percent said no, while 12.7 percent were unsure.

In our word association measure, students associated positive words when asked about their students in the schools 73.4 percent of the time and negative terms only 7.9 percent of the time. The words "your teacher in the school" received even higher praise: 76.4 percent gave positive words such as "warm, friendly," "helpful," "nice." Only 10.3 percent gave negative words such as "terrible," "problems," "scary." It might be added that the percentage of positive responses in these categories were exceeded only by the positive responses to the word "children" for which 86.2 percent gave positive responses and only 1.5 percent gave negative ones.

Learning Activities

1 The "Need to Know" Concept

It is the CEP assumption that ideas remain inviting and educationally worthwhile only in the presence of a student's perceived need to know. Combs has said: "Psychologists don't know much about learning, but one thing they do know: that people learn best when they have a need to know." (Wass et al., 1974, p. 6). The idea seems to be that unless a student perceives a need for the information being offered he will gain little from his classroom experience beyond ritualistically going through the paces. Combs quotes Snygg as saying, "The trouble with American education is that we are all trying to provide students with answers to problems they haven't got yet." (Wass et al., 1974, p. 7).

CEP is designed in ways it is hoped will maximize the opportunity for students to ferret out relevant questions regarding education. The field experience is the arena in which a majority of these questions are to be developed. As Blume has put it, "After working in the field for as little as one day students have many questions on their minds." (Wass et al., 1974). The field experience is a means by which a "need to know" is developed before any instruction takes place. It is felt essential, as Johnson has said, that the "need to know should precede exposure to information." (Johnson, 1973, p. 2).

Once a need to know is established, however, it is believed that "people do not need to be rewarded, cajoled or punished to deal with matters that affect them in important and immediate ways." (Wass et al., 1974, p. 7). Indeed, Blume contends, the entire learning experience is transformed when education deals with what a student wants to understand. "The instructor finds himself in the enviable position of working with a group in which all the participants have chosen to be there! The student has the advantage of attending only the workshops he needs and has chosen, and this element of choice leads to more positive experiences on the part of both the instructor and the student." (Wass et al., 1974, p. 17). This transformation of the learning process is possible, according to CEP philosophy, because students enjoy a program of maximum flexibility in which they can move at their own speeds and use learning activities to respond to specific, already formulated questions. Blume has said, "The importance of the student's right to choose his learning activity cannot be overemphasized. When students choose to study a particular topic, they involve themselves more completely than they do when the task is assigned by the instructor" (Wass et al., 1974, p. 19).

The "need to know" tenet of the CEP program is, of course, indisputable. It suffers, perhaps, from oversimplification and ignores intriguing and highly complicated philosophical questions regarding the

transactional nature of need and interest. This is, however, not the place to explore these issues. Rather, it is our purpose to measure the program against its own standards. Therefore, we asked students the following question regarding their study in substantive areas. "Think of the areas you are presently (within the last two weeks) working in. Why did you choose this area (these areas) at this time?"

The results of this inquiry are presented in Table 24.

Scheduling convenience was the reason most frequently given for entering into a substantive area; 59.5 percent of students gave this response. The second most frequent response given by 42.2 percent indicated that their reason for involvement in a substantive area was becamse they "had to get a certain number of learning activities out of the way and this one seemed as good as any." The questionnaire was administered over a six-week period, so these results cannot be attributed to an end of semester rush.

Since multiple answers were possible, students were not forced to choose between responses. It is important to note that only 27 students (13.2 percent) indicated they chose a particular area on the basis of a "need to know." This low percentage stands in contradiction to the stated philosophy that learning must be based on a "need to know." This is a general problem and the study provides no variables that suggested that only a certain kind of student failed to direct his or her educational activities on the basis of perceived needs. The percentage of students answering that they were studying a specific area due to a perceived need was not influenced significantly by either the team they belonged to (ten students from CEP I and 17 students from CEP III answered affirmatively in this category) or by the time they had spent in CEP (although there was a slight trend indicating that the longer a student was in CEP the less likely he was to enter a substantive area because it would answer a given need) (see Table 25) or by his seminar leader. Even when we spread responses over a scale measuring general attitude toward CEP (thereby separating those respondents who feel very positively toward the program from those who, by comparison, feel negatively) we failed to find significant differences in response to this question (see Table 26). Very few students from any category enter into substantive areas out of a "need to know."

TABLE 24

Reasons Given for Working in Substantive Areas
by Total Respondents and by Team

Response	Total	By Team		Chi Square Significance Level
		CEP I	CEP III	
Being offered at a time you were free	121 (59.3)[a]	70 (71.4)	51 (48.1)	.0012
Related to a Specific Problem you wanted to seek an answer to	27 (13.2)	10 (10.2)	17 (16.0)	none
Had to get a certain number of activities out of the way and this one seemed as good as any	86 (42.2)	46 (46.9)	40 (37.7)	none
Other reasons offered	59 (28.9)	20 (20.4)	39 (36.8)	.0201

Note: Multiple answers possible, totals add to more than 100%.

[a]Percentage of total responding

Table 25

"Need to know" as motivating factor for choosing learning activity by quarters in the program

Quarters completed	Number responding
0	7 (22.6)[a]
1	6 (26.1)
2	5 (10.9)
3	3 (9.7)
4	2 (8.7)
5 or more	4 (8.2)

[a]Percentage of students who could have responded

Table 26

Number choosing learning activities because "they related to a specific problem that you wanted to seek the answer to" by general attitude toward program

	N	Number saying motivated by "need to know"
Least positive	71	4 (5.6)[a]
Neutral	66	11 (16.7)
Most positive	67	12 (17.9)

[a]Percentages

2. The Coercion-Free Curriculum

The CEP was designed to cut down (if not totally cut out) the coercion that characterizes much of contemporary education. It was designed to maximize flexibility, drastically reduce time pressures by allowing students to work at their own pace and to heighten student interest by allowing students to modify learning activities to fit their own needs.

Results from the questionnaire indicate that CEP has not been very successful in eradicating the pressures which so often accompany the acquisition of knowledge. When we asked students to "identify the sources of any pressure you may be under," it was found that learning activities were the single greatest source of pressure in the CEP program. 46.6 percent of respondents identified learning activities as a

source of great pressure while only 7.4 percent did not feel pressure in this area (see Table 27).

Table 27

Learning activities as a source of pressure

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Great pressure	95	46.6
Moderate pressure	86	42.2
No pressure	15	7.4
Don't know or no answer	8	3.9

Another way of approaching this issue is by investigating the degree to which students are forced into activities against their will. It is the assumption of the program that CEP is organized in such a way as to eliminate coercion. Therefore, we asked students to identify areas of CEP in which they feel "forced to do things that you don't want to do and are not helpful to you."

52.5 percent of students indicated that they were forced to do non-meaningful learning activities always or much of the time. 39.2 percent of the students indicated that this was never or seldom the case (see Table 28).

Table 28

Learning Activities are forced and not helpful

Response	Absolute frequency	Relative percentages	Adjusted percentages
Always	35	17.2	17.8
Much of the time	72	35.3	36.5
Seldom	62	30.4	31.5
Never	18	8.8	9.1
Don't know	10	4.9	5.1
No response	7	3.4	Missing

3. Modifying Learning Activities in the Coercion-Free Curriculum

One of the ways pressure was to be eliminated from CEP was by establishing procedures whereby students would be able to adapt learning

activities to fit their own needs. As Blume has pointed out, "In this program some choice is always open to students even in the required learning activities. They have a choice not only of means to accomplish a task, but they have a choice of when to do it. They can study with a group or individually. If they have a logical alternative task they would rather do, they will probably be permitted to do that instead of the required one" (Wass et al., 1974, p. 19).

Inquiring into this issue we asked students whether or not they modified learning activities to suit their own interests and needs. We discovered that only 37.3 percent of all students had ever modified a learning activity. This finding did not vary significantly with either CEP team nor seminar leaders. It did, as might be expected, vary significantly with the length of time a student had participated in the CEP. The results indicate that it takes time for students to avail themselves of the modification option (see Table 29).

Table 29

Number of Students Modifying Learning Activities by length of time in CEP

Modified Learning Activities	Quarters completed in CEP						Totals
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Yes	1 (4.2)[a]	4 (19.0)	15 (36.6)	14 (46.7)	15 (65.2)	27 (57.4)	76 (40.9)
No	23 (95.8)	17 (81.0)	26 (63.4)	14 (46.7)	8 (34.8)	19 (40.1)	107 (57.5)
Don't remember	0	0	0	2 (6.7)		1 (2.1)	3 (1.6)
							186* (100)

*No responses = 18. Note that percentages are based on students answering both questions (time in program and modifying L.A.'s). Therefore, percentages differ somewhat from those referred to in preceding paragraph.

Chi square = 37.3 with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = .0000.

If the adapting of learning activities is an accurate indication of the degree to which students take an active participation in their own education, then the responses to this question should cause concern in the CEP. While more students avail themselves of the modification option

as they mature in the program, large numbers of students (44 percent of all students in the program for more than three quarters) have never modified a learning activity to fit their own needs. Those that have availed themselves of this option have done so only infrequently.

Why don't more students take advantage of this option? In order to explore this question we asked students in an earlier draft of the questionnaire why they hadn't modified learning activities. After examining and categorizing the responses to this question we were able to rework the question into a multiple choice format with an open end option built in. The answers to this question are presented in Table 30 below. Because answers varied according to CEP the table indicates responses by team membership. (See page 27 for Table 30.)

The biggest single reason given by students for failing to modify learning activities was a feeling of inadequacy. A near majority (48 percent) indicated that they did not feel they knew enough to modify learning activities. This may, of course, be an accurate perception, but it throws into serious question the extent to which the field experience is providing students with personally meaningful and pressing questions which learning activities may be adapted to answer. If the high response to this item indicates a lack of self confidence in coming up with adequate answers to pressing problems, it may also indicate that large percentages of students are not coming up with problems at all. It is important to note here that the answers on this item do not vary significantly with quarters completed in the program. As a matter of fact, the percentage of students indicating a lack of knowledge as a reason for not modifying learning activities is smaller among students just entering the program than at any other time in the CEP experience (see Table 31).

The other reasons given for not modifying learning activities are of interest also. Almost 30 percent of students feel too overworked to modify learning activities. While no educational program is against hard work, it would seem to violate the philosophy of CEP that so large a percentage of students feel "too busy" to be able to adjust learning activities to suit their own educational needs.

Similarly, we can be concerned over the fact that so large a proportion of students feel that the modifying option is open to them in name only. Fifty students (24.5 percent) felt that professors did not allow modification of their learning activities, while 60 students (almost 30 percent) felt professors discourage such activity. It is also disturbing that a significantly higher proportion of students in CEP I (that team which is purported to run in closest harmony with the program's philosophy) discouraged modification of learning activities (see Table 30).

4. Academic Interaction between students and faculty in the Coercion-Free Curriculum

Given the fact that learning activities do not seem to be serving the functions that the CEP philosophy hoped they would fill, it is important that we inquire into how learning activities are being completed. We do not have all the information on this topic that we would like (indeed, the questionnaire format is not necessarily the most accurate

TABLE 30

Reasons Indicated for Not Modifying Learning Activities by CEP Team

Reasons for not Modifying Learning Activities	CEP Team		Total	Chi Square Degree of Freedom Significance
	Team I	Team III		
Modifying learning activities entails more work than I have time for	28 (28.6)[a]	38 (30.2)	60 (29.4)	None
I don't know enough about most areas to know what to suggest	51 (52.0)	47 (48.0)	98 (48.0)	None
Some Professors don't allow you to change their activities	23 (23.5)	27 (25.5)	50 (24.5)	None
Some Professors allow you to modify activities but they discourage it overtly or subtly	36 (38.7)	24 (22.6)	60 (29.4)	4.21637 1 0.0400
I didn't know I was allowed to modify learning activities	9 (9.2)	9 (8.5)	18 (8.8)	None
Learning activities are O.K. as they are	20 (20.4)	18 (17.0)	38 (18.6)	None
Total Number	98	106	204	

Multiple answers possible therefore column numbers add to more than 100%.

TABLE 31

Reasons Indicated for Not Modifying Learning Activities
by Quarters Completed in Program

Response	Quarters Completed in CEP					Total	X^2 Significance Levels
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Number of Students	31[a]	23	46	31	23	49	203	
Modifying learning activities entails more work than I have time for	6 (19.4)[b]	3 (13.0)	15 (32.6)	13 (41.9)	8 (34.8)	14 (28.6)	59 (29.1)	.13
I don't know enough about most areas to know what to suggest	11 (35.5)	12 (52.2)	28 (60.9)	14 (45.2)	13 (56.5)	20 (40.8)	98 (48.3)	.23
Some professors don't allow you to change their activities	5 (16.1)	2 (8.7)	12 (26.1	12 (38.7)	6 (26.1)	12 (24.5)	49 (24.1)	.17
Some professors allow you to modify activities but they discourage it overtly or subtly	4 (12.9)	6 (26.1)	15 (32.6)	16 (51.6)	7 (30.4)	11 (22.4)	59 (29.1)	.02
I didn't know I was allowed to modify learning activities	3 (9.7)	3 (13.0)	4 (8.7)	3 (9.7)	3 (13.0)	2 (4.1)	18 (8.9)	.79
Learning activities are O.K. as they are	7 (22.6)	2 (8.7)	6 (13.0)	3 (9.7)	7 (30.4)	13 (26.5)	38 (18.7)	.13

[a]Total number of students in each quarter; cell percentages based on this number.

[b]Percentages. Multiple answers possible; percentages do not add to 100.

means of obtaining this kind of information), but what indications we do have are worth our attention.

While CEP was organized to facilitate certain kinds of interaction between faculty and students, nowhere in the literature can we find the claim that faculty are unnecessary to the educational process. It may well be that the importance that professors hold for themselves in this area is somewhat inflated and the tendency of professors to overly intrude into learning processes of students is unfortunate. A measure of this intrusion is indicated by the fact that credit has traditionally been assigned to a course in proportion to the amount of contact time students have with their professors. But it might be disturbing to find professors excluded from the helping process in education and used only as readers of learning activities and signers of credit slips. It is unlikely that CEP faculty will find easy agreement as to the optimal time professors should spend helping students with their learning. No doubt, there should be a great deal of flexibility in this matter. Yet, perhaps it should be a cause for concern to find that 43.2 percent of students queried indicated that they spent two hours or less per week in academic contact with their professors. The mean time spent by students getting faculty help in any setting is 2.85 hours per week. Table 32 presents the responses given by students to the question, "How many hours a week do you presently spend in an average week getting faculty help (in class or discussions with faculty) in completing your learning activities?"

Table 32

Number of hours per week spent getting faculty help (in class or discussion with faculty) completing learning activities

	1 or less	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	N.A.	Total
No. of Students	45	43	20	13	15	14	5	35	14	204
% of Students	22.1	21.1	9.8	6.4	7.4	6.9	2.5	17.2	6.9	100

Very different responses were given when students were asked, "How many hours a week do you spend alone or with other students working on learning activities?" 41.7 percent spent eight or more hours with other students working on learning activities. Table 33 presents the responses given to this question.

It is surprising to note that time spent getting help on learning activities from faculty and time spent completing those activities (alone or with other students) does not seem to vary significantly with quarters completed in the program, CEP team, seminar director or general disposition toward the program.

Table 33

Hours spent alone or with other students working on Learning Activities

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 or more	N.A.	Total
Number of Students	16	17	9	16	25	12	7	85	16	204
Percent of Students	7.8	8.3	4.4	7.8	12.7	5.9	3.4	41.7	7.8	100

5. Student Attitudes Toward Learning Activities

To get an understanding of how helpful students felt learning activities were we asked: "Speaking about learning activities as a whole, how helpful would you say they have been in preparing you for teaching?" (See Table 34) While 31.4 percent of all students saw learning activities to be very helpful, 55.1 percent saw them as somewhat helpful, while 13.5 percent saw them as seldom helpful or of no help at all. The percentage of students feeling that learning activities are always helpful is highest during the first two quarters of the students' experience in the program and then falls. While the percentage builds as the students near the end of the program, it never reaches the high point which characterizes student attitudes in their first two quarters in the program. (See Table 34 on page 31.)

One reason for a negative evaluation of learning activities could be that they are too difficult and ask too much of students. This, however, does not seem to be the case. When asked, "How intellectually challenging do you find your CEP work?" Only 15.2 percent of the students indicated that they found learning activities to be very challenging. There was a steady trend for students to find learning activities less challenging the longer they remained in the program. (See Table 35, p. 32)

Students, as any experienced teacher knows, will often seek ways out of what they perceive as an unpleasant situation. Cheating is one of the grosser forms of evation common in education. (Howard Becker et al., Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968, p. 98 ff.) We asked students if they had ever "Completed a learning activity by means which are not acceptable (e.g., used someone else's work, plagiarized, cheated, didn't read assigned topics)." The results from this question are reported in Table 36, page 33.

As indicated earlier, questionnaires, even those filled out anonymously, are probably not a good means of obtaining information on such issues as cheating. This could explain why such a low percentage of

TABLE 34

Degree to Which Students Feel Learning Activities are Helpful in Preparing Them for Teaching by Length of Time in Program

Helpfulness of Learning Activities	Quarters Completed in CEP						Row Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Very Helpful	8 (38.1)[a]	12 (54.5)	14 (32.6)	5 (17.2)	5 (21.7)	14 (29.8)	58 (31.4)
Somewhat Helpful	10 (47.6)	7 (31.8)	19 (44.2)	21 (72.4)	17 (73.9)	28 (59.6)	102 (55.1)
Seldom Helpful	2 (9.5)	3 (13.6)	10 (23.3)	3 (10.3)	1 (4.3)	5 (10.6)	24 (13.0)
Of No Help	1 (4.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (.5)
Column Total	21 (100)	22 (100)	43 (100)	29 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)	185 (100)

[a]Column Percentage

Chi Square = 26.36954 with 15 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0343

TABLE 35

Degree of Intellectual Challenge Found in Learning Activities by Length of Time in CEP

Amount of Challenge	Quarters Completed in CEP						Row Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Very Challenging	11 (35.5)[a]	4 (18.2)	8 (18.2)	3 (10.0)	1 (4.5)	3 (6.3)	30 (15.2)[b]
Somewhat Challenging	11 (35.5)	15 (68.2)	29 (65.9)	16 (53.3)	14 (16.6)	36 (75.0)	121 (61.4)
Seldom Challenging	1 (3.2)	3 (13.6)	7 (15.9)	10 (33.3)	7 (31.8)	8 (16.7)	36 (18.3)
Never Challenging or Don't know	8 (25.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.1)	10 (5.1)
Totals	31 (100)	22 (100)	44 (100)	30 (100)	22 (100)	48 (100)	197 (100.0)

Chi Square = 71.38646 with 15 degrees of freedom significance 0.0000

[a] Percentages in column

[b] Percentages in row total

TABLE 36

Number of Students Admitting to Cheating
by Length of Time in Program

Have you cheated?	Number of Quarters Completed in CEP						Row Totals
	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Yes	0 (0)[a]	0 (0)	5 (10.9)	7 (22.6)	10 (43.5)	11 (22.4)	33 (16.4)
No	28 (93.3)	22 (100.0)	41 (89.1)	24 (77.4)	13 (56.5)	36 (73.5)	164 (81.6)
Don't know	2 (6.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (4.1)	4 (2.0)
Column Total	30 (100)	22 (100)	46 (100)	31 (100)	23 (100)	49 (100)	201 (100%)

Chi Square 32.23787 with 10 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0004

[a]Percentages by row

students (16.4 percent) admit to cheating in CEP. Data for CEP are, however, at odds with the findings of studies among students of other colleges and universities. We can safely say, therefore, that CEP cheating is less frequent than in other college programs. For example, one national study reported that 50 percent of students surveyed by questionnaire admitted to cheating (William Bowers, 1964).

Table 36 shows that what cheating there is in CEP increases significantly with the time spent in the program. Such a finding should, of course, not be surprising. The longer a person is in the program the more chance he has to cheat. In Table 37 we see that 47.1 percent of students indicated that cheating was prevalent in CEP. (The wording of this question is important. Students were asked, "Do you think cheating is prevalent in CEP? That is, do you think most people cheat at least some of the time?") Only 15.2 percent, however, thought cheating occurred more frequently in CEP than in other college programs they had been in; 49.5 percent believed this was not the case (See Table 38).

Table 37

Do you think these activities are prevalent in CEP? That is, do you think most people use these means at least some of the time?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent
Yes	96	47.1
No	34	16.7
Don't know/missing	74	36.3

Table 38

From your experiences in college do you feel these kinds of activities are happening more frequently in CEP than in other programs you have been in?

Response	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percentage
Yes	31	15.2
No	101	49.5
Don't know/missing	72	35.3

One last measure of student response to learning activities was provided in this study. Students were asked to supply a word to describe

each of the number of aspects of CEP. In response to learning activities, 63.4 percent of students gave words judged by coders to be negative. Only 9.8 percent supplied positive words.

Student Self Concept in the Childhood Education Program

One of the more intriguing conceptions of the Childhood Education Program is its dedication to "helping young teachers discover how to use themselves effectively to carry out their own or society's purposes in the education of children" (Wass et al., 1974, p. 4). Combs has called this the "self-as-instrument" concept. Our study was not designed to test the accuracy of this concept. Unfortunately, we failed to very carefully evaluate the degree to which the program is carrying out its objectives in this area. However, what information we do have from students on questions relating to self concept are very positive. Further study is in order to determine the meaning of these findings.

When students were asked, "Is CEP helping you develop a positive self concept?" nearly 60 percent of those answering gave an affirmative response. Less than five percent said the program had hurt their self concept. This would seem to be a positive finding and its value is emphasized when we cross responses to this question with the length of time students have been in the program (See Table 39, page 36).

We asked students which substantive areas they felt had helped them grow into the persons they presently were. Only 12.7 percent of students indicated that no area had helped them grow as a person. Every substantive area contributed to the growth of at least some students and some areas were particularly effective in this regard. For example, 43.1 percent of all students indicated that art had helped their personal growth. This fact is made even more impressive when we find that 16.2 percent of students surveyed had gained credit for completing art outside the CEP program or had not yet begun the art area. Table 40 indicates the percentage of students who found each area helpful in their personal growth, together with the percentage of students who have completed the area outside of CEP, have not yet begun the area, have done less than one-half of the learning activities in the area, have completed more than one-half of the learning activities in the area, or have completed the area. (See Table 40, p. 37)

The percentage of students finding particular areas helpful to their personal growth varies somewhat by CEP. This might be expected due to the fact that faculty members teaching in a particular area often vary with CEP teams. It is not our purpose to evaluate individual instructors (there are more accurate statistics available from college-wide studies than are likely to be provided by this investigation) and we are, therefore, not reporting these data. If, however, individual instructors would like information regarding students' responses to questions in their substantive area, we will be happy to provide what information we have.

TABLE 39

Affect of Program on Students' Self-Concept
by Length of Time in Program

Affect of Program on Self Concept	Number of Quarters Completed in CEP						Row Totals
	In First Quarter	1	2	3	4	5 or more	
Helped Self-Concept	13 (46.4)[a]	14 (63.6)	23 (51.1)	16 (53.3)	11 (52.4)	40 (81.6)	117 (60.0)
Self-Concept has not Changed	14 (50.0)	8 (36.4)	17 (37.8)	12 (40.0)	8 (38.1)	8 (16.3)	67 (34.4)
Self-Concept Worse	1 (3.6)	0 (0)	5 (11.1)	2 (6.7)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	9 (4.6)
Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (9.5)	0 (0)	2 (1.0)
Column Totals	28 (14.4)	22 (11.3)	45 (23.1)	30 (15.4)	21 (10.8)	49 (25.1)	195 (100.0)

[a]Percentages

Chi Square 36.63393 with 15 degrees of freedom Significance 0.0014

TABLE 40

Percentage of Students Finding Various Substantial Areas Helpful in Personal Growth and Percentage of Students at Various Levels of Completion of Each Area

Area	Students Finding Area Helpful in Personal Growth	Status of Students in Subject Areas				
		Completed Area Outside CEP	Have Not Begun Area	Less Than 1/2 Completed	More Than 1/2 Completed	Completed Area
Reading	26.5[a]	3.4	19.1	19.6	19.6	28.9
Language Arts	30.9	2.5	18.1	21.6	17.6	32.4
Art	43.1	2.9	16.2	24.0	27.0	24.5
Math	26.0	1.0	17.6	19.1	23.5	30.9
Science	10.8	1.5	22.5	24.0	20.6	26.5
Social Studies	15.7	2.0	24.5	29.9	19.6	19.6
Social Foundations	28.4	13.2	25.5	27.0	11.3	18.6
Human Growth	29.9	30.4	28.9	4.9	3.9	25.5
Curriculum	29.9	2.0	23.5	30.4	17.6	22.1
Found no Area Helpful	12.7					

N = 204

[a]Percentage of all students finding area of study helpful in personal growth, e.g., 54 of 204, or 26.5 percent found reading helpful for personal growth.

One of the objectives of CEP is to develop students who are good problem-solvers (Wass et al., 1974). In CEP, learning activities are to help in developing problem-solving teachers. Our data indicate that learning activities may not be working out in the way envisioned by the program's founders. There are more *positive* results to be reported in other areas, however. Responsibility would generally be seen as a positive attribute for teachers. At Art Combs' suggestion we included a question in this area. We asked students, "Do you feel that CEP has added to your ability to accept responsibility?" Answers to this question are reported in Table 41.

Table 41

Has CEP added to your ability to accept responsibility?

	Yes	No	Unsure	N.A.	Total
Number of Students	162	24	14	4	204
Percent of Students	79.4	11.8	6.9	2.0	100

The ability to accept responsibility has grown in nearly 80 percent of CEP students. Only 11.8 percent did not feel that they have been helped in this regard and some of these students indicated that they already had this ability when they entered the program.

The gains made in this area are impressive. Their importance is only somewhat tempered by our lack of control data. It is hard to tell to what degree this is a general function of a college education and to what degree it is peculiar to CEP. In any case, it is an important achievement.

Conclusion

The questionnaire designed for this study disected the Childhood Education Program into its component parts so that various elements of the program could be viewed individually. We understand, however, that an educational program, like any other human enterprise, is likely to add to something more than the sum of its parts. Thus, it is possible that something essential to an entire program is lost when we examine it in pieces rather than as a totality. In an effort to limit if not eliminate this problem, some questions were asked of students which pertain to the program as a whole. While these questions may not totally offset the fragmentation problem, they do give us some reading of how students regard their overall experience in CEP.

We asked students, "Generally are you getting a good education?" Without comparison data from other programs it is hard to know for certain if a 65.3 percent affirmative response to this question is an improvement on traditional approaches to teacher education. A seemingly small portion of students (7.5 percent) indicated they were not getting a good education, but a larger group (27.1 percent) were uncertain about the quality of their education.

Table 42 reports the results from this question by quarters completed in the program. It can be seen from this table that students enter CEP with an understandable tentativeness. While only 3.4 percent make the judgment that they are not getting a good education in their first quarter of CEP, 44.8 percent are uncertain on this issue. 51.7 percent of first quarter students gave a positive response to this question. By the second quarter 73.9 percent gave a positive response. This percentage drops sharply in the next two quarters only to rise again as graduation approaches. (See Table 42 page 40.)

CEP does not fare as well when we asked a somewhat different question. When asked "Would you prefer a more traditional program if it included work in the schools?" 44.5 percent of students answered yes, 34.5 answered no and 21.0 indicated they were uncertain. Thus, 66.5 percent of students are not convinced that CEP is what they want from a teacher education program. Again, data such as these are of limited usefulness without comparison data from other programs. Yet, the fact that CEP prides itself on its student-centered orientation makes it hard for us to ignore so large a group of students who would prefer a more conventional program. If student perceptions make the difference we claim they do in education, then these statistics should give us pause. (See Table 43 page 41.)

It is often contended that students have a difficult time when they first enter the program and, as a result if initial confusions, are likely to develop negative feelings toward the program during their first quarter or two. It is assumed that with the experience of seminar, work in the school, need-based learning, and a strong feeling of community within CEP these apprehensions will fade and be replaced by a constellation of more positive feelings. This contention is not substantiated by answers given to the program preference question (See Table 43), although

Table 42

Overall Evaluation of CEP by Length of Time in Program

Generally, are you getting a good education?	Number of Quarters Completed in CEP						
	In First Quarter	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Row Totals
Yes	15 (51.7)[a]	17 (73.9)	32 (69.6)	15 (48.4)	18 (78.3)	33 (70.2)	130 (65.3)
No	1 (3.4)	0 (0.0)	5 (10.9)	4 (12.9)	3 (13.0)	2 (4.3)	15 (7.5)
Unsure	13 (44.8)	6 (26.1)	9 (19.6)	12 (38.7)	2 (8.7)	12 (25.5)	54 (27.1)
Column Totals	29 (100)	23 (100)	46 (100)	31 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)	199 (100)

[a]Percentages

Chi squared = 17.95 with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.056

Table 43

Prefer traditional program if it included work in schools
By length of time in program

Prefer Traditional Program	Number of Quarters Completed in CEP						
	In First Quarter	1	2	3	4	5	Row Totals
Yes	7 (23.3)[a]	9 (40.9)	20 (44.4)	19 (61.3)	13 (56.5)	21 (42.9)	89 (44.5)
No	8 (26.7)	10 (45.5)	17 (37.8)	8 (25.8)	7 (30.4)	19 (38.8)	69 (34.5)
Unsure	15 (50.0)	3 (7.1)	8 (19.0)	4 (9.5)	3 (7.1)	9 (21.4)	42 (21.0)
Column Totals	30 (100)	22 (100)	45 (100)	31 (100)	23 (100)	49 (100)	200 (100)

[a]Percentages
Chi squared = 22.94 with 10 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.011

it can find some support from answers to the general education question. (See Table 42.) Results from the question "Would you prefer a more traditional program if it included work in the schools?" suggest that students entered CEP with high hopes for the program. Only 23.3 percent of students in their first quarter indicate a preference for traditional programs. This percentage grows to a high of 61.3 percent when students are in their fourth quarter and drops to 42.9 percent as students grow nearer to graduation. When we look at these questions together, it can be said that while students become more convinced that they are getting a good education the longer they stay in the program, they also tend to believe in larger numbers that they would get a still better education from a traditional program which included work in the schools. It is hard to know on the basis of these data whether it is warranted to hold to the optimistic assumption that student attitudes improve with experience in CEP.

The following assertion is made in Humanistic Teacher Education:

> Question: Are there some students who don't function well in an atmosphere of student freedom and student responsibility? If so, what happens to them?
>
> Answer: Yes, there are a few. Most students have some difficulty in the beginning, but they overcome it, and learn to manage their own learning. Some never do and they are usually quite visible from the beginning. It is obvious they don't take the initiative to get essential things done and they avoid contact with the faculty until they are in a serious predicament. The faculty helps these students as much as possible and the seminar leader both helps and confronts the student with his behavior. Most of these students who cannot learn to cope with responsibilities drop out of the program voluntarily (Wass et al., 1974, p. 26).

Because we wanted to determine if optimistic statements such as this one were warranted, we selected eight general questions dealing with learning activities, self concept development, attitudes toward CEP, faculty and education. By sorting responses into positive and negative categories and collecting them across questions we were able to divide students into three groups; those who were "most satisfied," "moderately satisfied" and "least satisfied" with the Childhood Education Program. There were 58 students (28.4 percent of all students interviewed) who fell into the least satisfied category, 93 students (45.6 percent) in the moderately satisfied category, and 53 students (26.0 percent) in the most satisfied category. (See Table 44, page 43.)

We crossed these three groups of students with their answers to various questions. The results indicated that there are a substantial number of dissatisfied students who do not seem to "learn to cope" with the program, do not "drop out . . . voluntarily" and who do not find their dissatisfaction ameliorated as they proceed through CEP. This

Table 44

Overall Attitude Toward CEP Based on Eight Questions[a]

Score	Frequency
3	1
9	1
10	5
11	2
12	5
13	6
14	6
15	8
16	13
17	11
18	15
19	19
20	11
21	16
22	12
23	20
24	19
25	19
26	15

NOTE: Least satisfied defined as 17 or less; moderately satisfied 18 to 23; most satisfied 24 to 26.

[a]Questions scale included are noted in Appendix A.

can be seen in Table 45, which crosses overall satisfaction with the program by quarters in the program. Among 49 students in the program for at least five quarters, 11 are classified in the least satisfied category, 21 in the moderately satisfied category, and 17 in the most satisfied category. (See Table 45, page 45.)

Our study does not give us any indication as to what kind of students fall into the least satisfied category. This is a promising and much needed line of research and we hope it will be pursued in the near future. We did find, however, that students who fell on the least satisfied end of the satisfaction continuum were much more likely to answer negatively on a large number of other questions. To make this point as concisely as possible, we have selected the percentages of students giving negative responses to a number of questions and have presented these data in Table 46. We have omitted the positive answers to conserve space, but these data are available for those who desire to see them. (See Table 46, pages 46-49)

Table 46 reveals that student dissatisfaction among the least satisfied group spreads into every aspect of the program. Students in this category find fewer substantive areas helpful in their career preparation or in their development of selfhood, are more likely to perceive themselves as under pressure, to be dissatisfied with counseling, to be unsure of what is expected of them, and to work with their fellow students more infrequently. Further, this group of students is less likely to see learning activities as meaningful or intellectually challenging, less likely to have talked to professors, teachers or other students, regarding their work in school, to be less impressed with faculty performance and to be less sure that the faculty knows and likes them.

Perceptual psychology has long contended that individuals form constellations of attitudes which inform and influence their performance in many different aspects of their lives. The catalogue of discontents depicted in Table 46 is testimony to the truth of this insight. If Arthur Combs is correct when he says, "Good teachers seem always concerned with how things look to the person they are working with . . . " (Wass et al., 1974, p. 3) then it behooves CEP personnel to take a close and sympathetic look at the attitudes of CEP students, most especially those students who show a persistent trend toward discontent. It will not do to assume that only a few students fall into this category, for their numbers are large. It will not do to assume that they weed themselves out of the program for, while some may have the luxury of going elsewhere, many stay with the program to the end. It is hard to argue that the CEP experience has done these students good despite their dissatisfactions, for such a position would seem to violate the psychological principles upon which the Childhood Education Program was based. We can take little comfort in the uninformed hope that CEP fares better on attitudinal ("consumer satisfaction") measures than do more traditional programs, for the philosophy of the program is that an education which ignores the perceived meanings of students is no education at all.

Table 45

Overall Satisfaction with CEP by Quarters in Program

Quarters Completed	Least Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Most Satisfied	Row Totals
0	11 (19.3)[a] (35.5)[b]	12 (12.9) (38.7)	8 (15.1) (2.58)	31 (100)
1	6 (10.5) (26.1)	10 (10.8) (43.5)	7 (13.2) (30.4)	23 (100)
2	11 (19.3) (23.9)	22 (23.7) (47.8)	13 (24.5) (28.3)	46 (100)
3	12 (21.1) (38.7)	16 (17.2) (51.6)	3 (5.7) (9.7)	31 (100)
4	6 (10.5) (26.1)	12 (12.9) (52.2)	5 (9.4) (21.7)	23 (100)
5 or more	11 (29.3) (22.4)	21 (22.6) (42.9)	17 (32.1) (34.7)	49 (100)
Column Totals	57 (100)	93 (100)	53 (100)	N = 203

[a]Column percentages

[b]Row percentages

Chi square = 16.31 with 10 degrees of freedom significance = 0.295

Table 46

Percentage of Students with Negative Responses by Overall Satisfaction with CEP

	Least Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Most Satisfied
Seminars helpful? Seldom or of no help (P. 2 #35)[a]	22.3	17.3	7.7
Community Session helpful? Seldom or of no help (P. 2 #37)[b]	72.0	62.2	39.6
Learning Activities helpful? Seldom or of no help (P. 2 #38)	33.3	11.4	0.0
Have you plagiarized? Yes (P. 3 #41)	21.4	18.3	7.5
No CEP area has made me grow as a person (P. 3 #46)	22.4	10.8	5.7
Have you ever modified learning activities? No (P. 4 #57)	67.3	53.6	54.9
How much pressure are you under compared to your college study before you entered CEP? Great Pressure (P. 5 #76)	51.9	24.7	6.0
Learning activies forced? Always (P. 5 #80)	20.4	20.9	9.6
Field experiences forced? Always (P. 5 #7)	18.9	22.2	9.8

Table 46 (continued)

	Least Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Most Satisfied
Work with students less in CEP (P. 6 #10)	32.1	17.8	11.3
Introduction to CEP satisfactory? No. (P. 6 #11)	84.2	69.9	47.2
Did introduction give you all the information needed? No. (P. 6 #12)	91.2	83.9	64.2
Did introduction explain what was expected of you? No. (P. 6 #13)	80.4	57.1	43.4
Do you now know what is expected of you? No. (P. 6 #16)	10.7	0.0	0.0
Is CEP helping your self concept? No change or worse (P. 6 #14)[b]	85.8	63.7	50.9
Do students have the power to make major changes? No (P. 6 #17)	35.1	21.5	0.0
Would you prefer a more traditional program? Yes (P. 7 #21)[b]	78.6	47.8	3.8
Hours getting faculty help? One	35.4	20.9	17.6
Eight (P. 7 #22)	20.8	18.7	15.7

Table 46 (continued)

	Least Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Most Satisfied
Hours in school? Eight or more (P. 7 #24)	77.2	81.5	75.0
Has CEP affected your social life? Hurt it (P 7 #26)	42.9	28.3	13.5
Do you know CEP faculty better? No (P. 7 #27)	60.7	33.7	11.3
Who have you talked to about problems in your field experience in the school? CEP faculty - No (P. 8 #29)	65.5	57.0	43.4
Teachers in school - No (P. 8 #30)	56.9	49.5	22.6
CEP students - No (P. 8 #31)	48.3	44.1	22.6
How does CEP faculty compare with faculty before entering CEP? Worse (P. 8 #35)[b]	25.0	3.3	0.0
Is faculty doing an adequate job to prepare you for teaching? No. (P. 8 #36)[b]	42.1	3.2	0.0
Attitude toward CEP changed for worse since entering program (P. 8 #40)	35.7	9.2	2.6
Are you getting a good education? No. (P. 8 #41)[b]	27.3	0.0	1.9

Table 46 (continued)

	Least Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Most Satisfied
Is the faculty fulfilling its responsibility? No (P. 8 #43)[b]	37.7	6.5	0.0
Has CEP helped you accept responsibility? No (P. 10 #69)	34.5	5.4	0.0

[a]Page and number of question on questionnaire. See Appendix A.

[b]One of eight questions used to classify students' overall satisfaction.

While we are anxious to make the point that there is a large group of dissatisfied students within the CEP program we do not want this to be taken to mean that all dissatisfaction springs from this group. This is not the case. There are areas of concern which can be found even within the most ardent supporters of the program. Among the findings which cut across the satisfaction continuum and which we feel must be addressed are the following:

1. The fact that so few students engage in learning activities out of what they define as "a need to know."

2. The fact that over half of the students interviewed indicated that they spent three hours or less per week in contact with faculty on substantive area work.

3. The apparent lack of connection between field work and substantive area concerns.

4. The generally inadequate way in which students are introduced into the Childhood Education Program.

5. The failure of community sessions to aid in developing a sense of community.

6. The fact that students tend to prefer a more traditional program of teacher preparation which incorporates work in the schools.

7. The large percentage of students who indicate uncertainty as to whether or not the faculty is doing an adequate job and who indicate that it is difficult to locate and talk with professors.

On the other side of the issue we would not want anyone to conclude that the authors feel that the Childhood Education Program is not a valuable and promising innovation in teacher education. The authors undertook this research believing that CEP had many advantages over traditional programs. While this research has clarified problem areas for us, it has not changed our minds regarding the basic truth of this assertion. Among the most dramatic achievements of the program which our research has documented are the following:

1. The loyalty and enthusiasm the CEP program engenders in students, especially those who fall on the most positive end of the satisfaction continuum.

2. The fact that the 31.4 percent of students indicated a growth in their sense of responsibility since joining the program.

3. The high degree of student satisfaction regarding seminars.

4. The general belief among students that learning activities and substantive areas are doing an adequate to outstanding job in preparing them for a career in teaching.

5. The near universal enthusiasm regarding the field experience.

6. The impressive number of students indicating that many substantive areas and the CEP experience in general have helped them to develop a positive self concept.

7. The fact that the amount of student cheating in CEP seems to be substantially lower than is found in other college programs.

8. The fact that students seem to spend a good deal of time learning from and with one another.

9. The fact that most students believe they have the power to make changes in CEP.

This research was initially undertaken because students and faculty were providing us with a variety of assertions about what students thought about the program. As we discussed the conflicting assertions with students we found many interested in the issue and willing to pursue it empirically. Believing this would be a valuable educative experience for these students and because we were curious about what the findings would be, we helped get the research project under way. Naturally, the information we gleaned from the project needed to be shared with the students who had filled out the questionnaire, as well as with the faculty. We realize, however, that because we were comparatively new to the program and because our budgetary home was within another department, our intentions could be misconstrued. We have made an effort, therefore, to keep our operations, progress, intentions and findings public and to maintain close contact with our colleagues in the Childhood Education Department. We hope we have done our work well and that our research will help to make a promising program succeed.

Appendix A

CEP Questionnaire
Student Research Project

Code Number
Col. 1 /_/
2 /_/
3 /_/
4 /_/

Who is your seminar leader? _____

Are you in CEP I, II, III or IV? Col. 5 /_/

What is your age? (Circle the appropriate answer)

Col. 6
1 Below 20
2 20 to 25
3 26 and over

What is your sex? Col. 7
1 Male
2 Female

Do you plan to teach? (Circle the appropriate answer)

Col. 8
1 Yes
2 No
3 Don't know

Where did you spend your first 2 years of college?

Col. 9
I attended Jr. College 1
I attended other University 2
I attended U. of F. 3
Other (specify) _____ 4

How many quarters have you completed in the CEP Program? (Circle the appropriate number)
Col. 10 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

How many different schools have you worked in while in CEP? (Circle the appropriate number)
Col. 11 0 1 2 3 4 5 6

What is or was your father's type of occupation. If more than one circle the predominant type.
Col. 12
1. Farmer
2. Unskilled worker
3. Skilled or semi-skilled worker
4. Clerical or Sales worker
5. Managerial or self-employed
6. Professional or semi-professional
7. Don't know

What was the educational attainment of your father?
Col. 13
1. Elementary school completed or less
2. Some high school
3. High school graduate
4. Some college
5. College graduate (4 years)
6. Graduate work after college
7. Don't know

Below are a list of subject areas. Tell us how much work you have completed in each area or if you completed the course outside the program. For each of the areas in which you have handed in ½ or more of the activities, tell us how helpful they have been in preparing you for your career in teaching.

		Completed outside CEP	How many learning activities have you completed in this area?				If you have done ½ or more of the learning activities, tell us how helpful the area has been in preparing you for teaching.			
			Have not begun	Less ½	more ½	Completed	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	seldom helpful	Of no help
14	Reading	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	15	1	2	3	4
16	Lang. Art	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	17	1	2	3	4
18	Art	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	19	1	2	3	4
20	Math	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	21	1	2	3	4
22	Science	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	23	1	2	3	4
24	Social Studies	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	25	1	2	3	4
26	Social Found.	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	27	1	2	3	4
28	Human Growth	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	29	1	2	3	4
30	Curriculum	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	31	1	2	3	4
32	Other (specify)	1	2	3	4 5 answer →	33	1	2	3	4

		How often have you attended the following?					How helpful have you found these activities in preparing you for teaching?			
		Almost never	Infre-quently	Almost always	Always		Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	seldom helpful	Of no help
34	Seminar	1	2	3	4	35	1	2	3	4
36	Comm. Session	1	2	3	4	37	1	2	3	4

Speaking about learning activities as a whole would you say that they have been generally very helpful, somewhat helpful, seldom helpful or of no help in preparing you for teaching? (Circle the appropriate number)

Col. 38* Very helpful 1 Somewhat helpful 2 Seldom helpful 3 of no help 4

Explain why you say that: _____

Col. 39

_____

_____

*Question included in overall attitude toward CEP scale.

How intellectually challenging do you find your CEP work to be? (Circle the appropriate number).

Col. 40

1. Very Challenging (I have to do a great deal of thinking to do an acceptable job on all of my learning activities.)

2. Somewhat Challenging (I have to do a great deal of thinking on most but not all of my learning activities.)

3. Seldom Challenging (Most of the time the work I have to do does not take much thought or intellectual effort)

4. Never Challenging (You don't have to use your intelligence to do an acceptable job.)

5. Don't know

Have you, for any reason, ever completed a learning activity by means which are not acceptable? (e.g. used someone else's work, plagerized, cheated, didn't read assigned topics, etc.)

	YES	NO	Don't want to talk about it	Don't know
Col. 41	1	2	3	4

Do you think these activities are prevalent in CEP? That is, do you think most people use these means at least some of the time?

	YES	NO	Don't want to talk about IT	Don't know
Col. 42	1	2	3	4

From your experience in college do you feel these kinds of activities are happening more frequently in CEP than in other programs you have been in?

	YES	NO	Don't know
Col. 43	1	2	3

Would you please explain your answer and make any comments you might like to on the topic of cheating.

Col. 44 _____

Col. 45 _____

_____

Sometimes courses not only give you facts but help you in your growth as a person. Would you check any subject areas that you believe have helped you grow into the person you presently are: (Put the number 1 in the appropriate box.)

Col. 46	/ /	no CEP area has made me grow as a person	52	/ /	social studies
47	/ /	reading	53	/ /	social foundations
48	/ /	language arts	54	/ /	human growth
49	/ /	art	55	/ /	curriculum
50	/ /	math	56	/ /	other _____ (specify)
51	/ /	science			

Have you ever proposed or modified learning activities to suit your own needs and interests?

Col. 57 YES 1 — go on to the next question

NO 2 / Don't remember 3 — skip the next question

If yes: would you list the subject areas in which you have proposed or modified learning activities and tell us how frequently you have done so?

Subject area		once	2 or 3 times	4 or more times
Col 58 _____	Col 59	1	2	3
Col 60 _____	Col 61	1	2	3
Col 62 _____	Col 63	1	2	3

We would like to know why you or other students don't take more advantage of the opportunity to change or modify learning activities. Below is a list of possible reasons.

Would you please indicate which of these statements, if any, are the real reasons people don't change learning activities more often. You may choose more than one reason if you think it is applicable and come up with other reasons if you know of any. (Put a 1 (one) in the appropriate box or Boxes.)

Col 64 ☐ Modifying learning activities entails more work than I have time for.

Col 65 ☐ I don't know enough about most areas to know what to suggest.

Col 66 ☐ Some professors don't allow you to change their activities.

Col 67 ☐ Some professors allow you to modify activities but they discourage it overtly or subtly.

Col 68 ☐ I didn't know I was allowed to modify activities.

Col 69 ☐ Learning activities seem O.K. as they are.

Can you think of any other reason? (specify) _____

Col. 70

_____

_____

_____

We would like to identify the source of any pressure you may be under. For each of the activities I am about to list, please tell me if it is the source of no pressure, moderate pressure or great pressure. (Circle the appropriate answer)

		No Pressure	Moderate Pressure	Great Pressure	Don't Know
Col 71	Seminar	1	2	3	4
Col 72	Comm. Sessions	1	2	3	4
Col 73	Learn. Activity	1	2	3	4
Col 74	Working with teachers in sch.	1	2	3	4
Col 75	Working with children in sch.	1	2	3	4
Col 76	How much pressure are you under compared to your college study before you entered CEP?	1	2	3	4
Col 77	Other sources & pressure / _____ (specify)	1	2	3	4

Are you forced to do things that you don't want to do and are not helpful to you? For each of the activities I will read, tell me if you are forced to do activity always, most of the time, seldom or never.

		Always	Much of the time	Seldom	Never	Don't Know
Col 78	Seminar	1	2	3	4	5
Col 79	Comm. Sessions	1	2	3	4	5
Col 80	Learn. Activity	1	2	3	4	5
Col 7	Field Exper.	1	2	3	4	5
Col 8	Other _____ (specify)	1	2	3	4	5

Some learning activities may supply you with meaningful concepts and others may give you less useful information. Would you rate the learning activities you have completed. If they <u>generally</u> supplied meaningful concepts rate them with a high number. If they <u>generally</u> just supplied useless information give them a low number. (Circle the appropriate answer.)

Col. 9* Generally useless information (1) | Seldom meaningful (2) | Sometimes meaningful (3) | Generally meaningful (4)

Compared with more traditional programs, how do you find that the learning activity system of CEP effect your contact with other students? (Circle the appropriate answer.)

Col. 10
1. I work with other students less in CEP.
2. I work with other students about the same amount in CEP.
3. I work with other students more in CEP.

Was your introduction to CEP in your first weeks in the program satisfactory? Circle the appropriate answer.)

Col. 11 Yes (1) | No (2) | Don't Know (3)

Did it give you all the information you needed to know?

Col. 12 Yes (1) | No (2) | Don't Know (3)

Did it explain what was expected of you?

Col. 13 Yes (1) | No (2) | Don't Know (3)

Is the CEP Program helping you develop a positive self concept?

Col. 14* Yes it is helping | My self concept has not changed | My self concept is changing for the worse

Can you tell us why you say that?_____
Col. 15
_____

_____.

Do you feel you know now what is expected of you in CEP?

Col. 16 Yes (1) | No (2) | Unsure (3)

Do you believe that students as a group really have the power to make major changes in CEP?

Col. 17 Yes (1) | No (2) | Don't Know (3)

Explain your answer._____

Col. 18_____.

Has anyone ever counseled you about your program?

Col. 19 Yes (1) — answer next question | No (2) | Unsure (3) — Skip next question

Were you satisfied with that counseling?

Col. 20 Yes (1) | No (2) | Unsure (3)

Explain_____

_____.

Would you prefer a more traditional program than CEP if it included work in the schools?

Col. 21* Yes (1) | No (2) | Unsure (3)

How many hours a week do you presently spend in an average week getting faculty help (in class or in duscussions with faculty) in completing your learning activities? (Circle the appropriate number of hours)

Col. 22 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

How many hours a week do you spend alone or with other students working or learning activities?

Col. 23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

How many hours per week do you spend in schools?

Col. 24 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

How many hours per week do you spend preparing for your work in schools?

Col. 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

Has CEP had an effect on your social life?

Col. 26 Yes, improved it (1) | No change (2) | Hurt it (3)

Do you know the CEP faculty better than the faculty in your previous college experience?

Col. 27 Yes (1) | No (2) | Other (3)

Col. 28 Explain your answer_____

_____

_____.

Think Carefully:
In the last two weeks, who have you talked to about specific problems in your field experience in the school?

	Talked to	Rate how helpful they were in solving your problem			
		Very helpful			Of no help
Col. 29	/ /CEP Faculty	1	2	3	4
Col. 30	/ /Teachers in School	1	2	3	4
Col. 31	/ /CEP students	1	2	3	4
Col. 32	/ /Other students	1	2	3	4
Col. 33	/ /Parents, Husbands, Wives	1	2	3	4
Col. 34	/ /Other (specify)_____	1	2	3	4

_____

_____

How do you see, generally, the CEP faculty as different from the faculty you had before you entered CEP?

	Better	About the same	Worse	Don't Know
Col. 35*	1	2	3	4

Do you feel that the faculty is doing an adequate job in preparing you for teaching?

	Yes	No	Unsure
Col. 36*	1	2	3

Please explain your answer_____
Col. 37

_____

_____.

Generally do you feel that the CEP faculty knows and likes you?

	Yes	No	Unsure
Col. 38	1	2	3

Has your attitude toward the CEP program changed since your first term in it?

	Yes	No	Unsure	Presently in first term
Col. 39	1	2	3	4

If yes: Has your attitude changed. . .(Circle the appropriate answer)
Col. 40

1. Drastically for the better
2. Slightly for the better
3. I've adapted
4. Slightly for the worse
5. Drastically for the worse
6. Other_____.
(specify)

Generally, are your getting a good education?

	Yes	No	Unsure
Col. 41*	1	2	3

Why do you feel this way?

Without the field experience would you feel you were getting a good education?

	Yes	No	Unsure
Col. 42	1	2	3

Generally, is the faculty fulfilling its responsibility to help train you to become a teacher?

	Yes	No	Unsure
Col. 43*	1	2	3

What do you take to be the two biggest problems in CEP? _____
Col. 44

_____
Col. 45

_____.

What are the two strongest points of the program?_____
Col. 46

_____
Col. 47

_____.

What, if any, changes do you think are absolutely necessary for CEP?_____
Col. 48

_____
Col. 49

_____.

Rate the flexibility of the faculty from 1 to 4. (Circle the appropriate number.)
Col. 50 Very flexible 1 2 3 4 Not flexible
Explain_____

_____

_____.

How easy is it to find and talk with faculty? (circle the appropriate number).
Col. 51
1. Very easy
2. Somewhat easy
3. Somewhat difficult
4. Very difficult

How long does it take you to get organized and begin work each term?

	Less than a week	one week	two weeks	three weeks	4 or more weeks
Col. 52	1	2	3	4	5

What problems are there with taking outside classes while in CEP?
Put a 1 (one) in the appropriate box or boxes)
Col. 53 ☐ Schedule problems
Col. 54 ☐ Takes more time than I have to give it
Col. 55 ☐ Does not relate to teaching
Col. 56 ☐ Other: Explain_____

_____

_____.

Think of the areas in which you are presently (within the last two weeks) completing learning activities. Why did you choose this area (these areas) at this time? Was it because: (Put a one in the appropriate box or boxes.)

Col. 57 ☐ They were being offered at a time you were free.
Col. 58 ☐ Because they related to a specific problem that you wanted to seek the answer too.
Col. 59 ☐ Because you had to get a certain number of learning activities out of the way and this one seemed as good as any.
Col. 60 ☐ Other, specify_____

_____.

Give us the first word that comes to your mind for each of the following.

Col. 61 _____CEP

Col. 62 _____Seminar

Col. 63 _____Learning Activities

Col. 64 _____Your students

Col. 65 _____Your teacher in the school

Col. 66 _____Community Sessions

Col. 67 _____Children

How would you classify yourself in regard to your political philosophy? (Circle the appropriate number)

Col. 68
1. Conservative
2. Tend to be conservative
3. Tend to be liberal
4. Liberal
5. Unsure

Do you feel that the CEP program has added to your ability to accept responsibility?

	Yes	No	Unsure
Col. 69	1	2	3

Explain your answer:_____
Col. 70

_____

_____.

Col. 71 Col. 72

Col. 73 Col. 74